

MM 87-268

From: Tom Smith <tesmith@phoenix.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 2:31pm
Subject: I support switch to digital TV

I just wanted to voice my support for digital TV. I read that you were seeking public oppinion on the matter.

Onward and upward!
Tom Smith

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: <TomGAtkins@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 9:53pm
Subject: High-definition TV

MM 87-268
RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

There was an article in the Houston Chronicle 12-7-96 regarding High-definition television. I have the following comments:

My wife and I are a middle-aged upper middle-income family with no children at home. We are both professional people, and we spend a significant amount of time watching TV.

The main TV in the den and the one in the game room were purchased in 1982. They have been good sets; however, I would like to purchase a larger screen for the den.

I would like to purchase a HDTV set, as my experience with units indicates I usually get 12 years plus out of a set. My understanding is that most of the rest of the world has HDTV broadcasting abilities at the present. If we are delaying the conversion to HDTV because of politics, shame on us, but it would not surprise me.

As to the controversy regarding furnishing existing networks with additional "free" broadcast channels, I do not see why that is an unsurmountable problem. It seems to me that most people in this country watch TV; however, "most" people do not have cellular or other wireless communication. The preference to TV networks is understandable and is in the public interest. It appears to me that if networks were given additional "free" channels, that they should be required to furnish more public service information, limit their advertising time to less than present, and present a more "quality" product. I understand we live in a democratic country; however, I do not believe the rights of individuals, companies, or TV networks rights should include corrupting the impressionable uneducated masses who apparently "prefer" some of the trash that is on presently. I have not been poled in many, many years as to what I watch or prefer. The time that the "free" channels should be limited as to how long both analog and digital transmission is required by the public. I do not know why the time must be set now. If it is; however, once the "free" channels are not required for dual transmission, then either the networks should pay for them, or they should be deferred from the networks back to the FCC for possible auction to additional stations.

Regardless of the method of distributing the channels, let's get on with it.

The sooner decisions are made, the sooner more sets will be sold, and as with most products, the price for these sets should be reduced when they are sold in large quantities.

Yours truly,
Thomas G. Atkins
12302 Moorcreek
Houston, Tx 77070

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: MR WILLIAM J SPITZ <JXFS28A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 9:18pm
Subject: Give away

I am shocked that we are about to give the owners of tv stations over 2 billion gift. It is ludicrous that at a time we are trying to balance our nation's budget that we would even consider this foolish operation. Please. Please reconsider this poor decision.
signed - Silver Fox

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: <JHansen246@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 9:00pm
Subject: High Definition TV

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

Reed Hunt, Chairman, FCC:

I am against the present proposal to manipulate US consumers into an expensive switch to HDTV. The scheme stinks. The estimated cost of \$187 billion, like nearly every other project's actual cost, is sure to grow much larger. I am not willing to provide a defacto gift to private broadcast companies.

A alleged fact, published in today's "Houston Chronicle," claims that most consumers keep their TV sets for five to eight years. What is the useful life cycle of a 1996 model 27" color television? I suspect that most units will last about 10-12 years. The alleged facts are muddled by people purchasing additional televisions. The benefits of HDTV to the consumer are unclear and do not appear to presently offer sufficient benefit to warrant the expense.

However, if we are stuck with a government forced shift to HDTV, then all proceeds of frequency sales, licenses, etc., should be specifically designated to reduce US Government debt. Proceed should not be used to pay interest but must be used to pay principal.

HDVT now is a bad idea, and a bad plan at the wrong time. Let the open market dictate when we shift to HDTV.

Dennis Hansen
Houston, TX

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Tony Willoughby <Tony_Willoughby.IBM__INTERNAL.IBM__EXTERNAL@gemini.ibm.com>
To: fccinfo <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/7/96 8:48pm
Subject: HDTV

I want my HDTV and I want it now! I want a 70" RCA HDTV console connected to a 166Mhz Pentium machine with 128Kbps ISDN or cable access to the internet as well as traditional programming. I want to see Hakeem "The Dream" Olajuwon humiliating Shaq one more time, but at millions of pixels instead of hundreds of thousands. I want HDTV picture in picture or computer overlay so that I can see digital TV and work on my home computer at the same time, on the same screen. Most of all, I want the good old US of A to show the Japanese how high tech is really done. Damn the torpedos, full speed ahead!

JAN 19 1996

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-248

JAN 19 1996

From: John W Fermier <fermier@hal-pc.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 1:38pm
Subject: HDTV

Gentlemen, 1/8/96

Yesterday in the Houston Chronicle I read an article on the new High Definition Television and it sounds great. Except for the part about having to have a new 35" TV to see it or \$200.00 for a converter to see it on regular TV. I am part of middle income group with two kids in college. The last thing that I need to do is have to buy a new 35" TV or 6 \$200.00 converter boxes for my existing TV's and I make good money. What about the poor working guy who is having a hard time putting bread on the table for his family? It is one thing that he can not afford cable, but lets not cut him off from public tv. Our local PBS station is one of the best educational tools the poor have.

If you want to let the TV Stations have extra channels to broadcast their HDTV on that's fine but please do not take TV away from the rest of us and especially the less fortunate individuals. I really do think the working single Mom at Wal-mart can afford to buy a new 35" HDTV while she is on food stamps but her little kids sure do need access to our educational PBS station.

While I am on the subject I always thought the TV stations were supposed to provide a public service to maintain their license. All I see is Commercials and ads to join the Marines/Army/Navy etc. Where is the Educational shows and don't tell me the Power Rangers are an educational show. Most of today's kid's shows are really long play commercials for the toy makers and cereal makers.

Please revisit the rules and regs that govern the TV Stations and remember they are to serve the Public Need and not the other way around.

Thank's for Your Time & Consideration

John W. Fermier

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-260

From: <larry.dirnberger@bbs.hal-pc.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 9:59am
Subject: DIGITAL TV

JAN 19 1996

The article in the Sunday, Jan 7, edition of the Houston Chronicle titled "BIG-DIGIT TELEVISION" says to me that the rush to apply this technology by TV stations is an unnecessary and potentially costly action. I see no advantages to the average consumer that will justify the costs involved.

If the technology is worthwhile, let the market demand it rather than letting existing station franchisees control it.

Larry and Jan Dirnberger, 135 Woodhaven Lane, Seabrook, TX 77586

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Walter Kessinger <s40wake@gtri14.gtri.harc.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 8:57am
Subject: HDTV

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission fccinfo@fcc.gov

Dear Mr. Hundt,

I am writing to say that I am eagerly anticipating the transition to HDTV. For the most part, I support Rep. Jack Fields proposals for a staggered transition to national HDTV standards.

I do believe that television broadcasters should be required to compete and pay for broadcasting frequencies through an FCC run auction. However, I also believe that broadcasting frequencies should be awarded in packages that allow for parallel analog and digital transmissions. This will help encourage the transition to HDTV digital broadcasting.

Make no mistake, however, that as a consumer I WANT MY HDTV!

Sincerely,
Walter Kessinger

Walter Kessinger | www: <http://gtri.harc.edu/~s40wake/>
HARC Geotechnology | email: s40wake@gtri.harc.edu
4800 Research Forest Drive | office: 713-364-6082
The Woodlands, TX 77381 | fax: 713-363-7924

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <WPUSER#123#DHEC4001.COLUMB20#c#HOLLABLF#125#%OFFICE@gm0.state.sc.us>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 8:24am
Subject: High Definition TV

Please do NOT make any rulings which would require ordinary folks to scrap current television sets so that those who can afford big screen TV's can get a better picture.

We just replaced two TV's in our household and I'd be mighty disappointed if they soon became obsolete.

Thanks for your help.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Karen Wiesner <watsonk@vax.sonoma.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 2:04am
Subject: HDTV & free new spectrum to major broadcasters

I am just one voice among many who find it exceedingly inappropriate that ABC, NBC & CBS (among others) should be GIVEN increased spectrum when the "wireless" industry is forced to pay for same. President Clinton's plan to auction these additional bands appears to me to be a far more acceptable plan of action. I would appreciate any additional info. you can make available to me.
Thank you,
Karen L. Wiesner
800 Shiloh Canyon
Santa Rosa, CA. 95403

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <McKMitch@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/2/96 7:34pm
Subject: Digital Television

Regarding the proposal by ABC, NBC, and CBS to have the taxpayers foot the bill by giving them each one free channel to send out digital signals for new digital television sets. If we taxpayers were allowed to vote on this I would vote NO.

Mitch McKibbin
Email: mckmitch@aol.com

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

From: Dean Wilhite <wilhite@hudnet.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/1/96 1:24pm
Subject: Broadcasters want HDTV at our expense!

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

I was alarmed to read press accounts of the broadcasters' desire to render obsolete millions of television sets in our country, via the adoption of HDTV as a "new" broadcast standard. My sentiments are closely aligned with those of Mr. Reed Hundt, as I do not wish to "subsidize" the broadcasters in their endeavor to build market share and hog "public airwave space" for their personal gain.

I am a Television Production/Video/Photography teacher in the public school system in my town in southeast Kansas. My students and I often discuss the lousy state of affairs with the quality of American network and syndicated programming. And these are the same people who pretend to know what's good for us? Are these not the same people who are under political, social and economic pressure to stop glorifying weird sex, dysfunctional families and crime in their quest for "market share [a.k.a. profits]?"

I remember reading of the historical accounts when Britain switched from the old 409-line scan system in the 1940s and 1950s and went to their present system, and even THEY had a "grace" period (lasting into the 1960s if historical accounts are correct) when some "outdated" TVs were usable due to the regulation that broadcasters transmit TV signals in dual formats for a time. I believe the history books in the offices of our network presidents, and even the government, will bear this out (I found the information in magazines like Multimedia Producer and Videography).

Please mark my sentiments in this battle. What the industry leaders are proposing to do, with all undue speed and without public input, is no less than a scheme to spur the sale of TV sets, freeze out spectrum competition, and serve their own interests.

Please let me know what I can do to add my voice to this battle. I may not have the profits of NBC, Turner or Thomson but I'm also aware how enough angry people can create viable dialog!!

Dean Wilhite
Parsons High School
Parsons, Kansas wilhite@hudnet.com

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <GWarren238@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/1/96 10:27am
Subject: HDTV

Chairman Hundt

January 1,

1996

F.C.C. Washington D.C.

Dear sir: I wish to lodge a protest against the granting of new spectrums to the television broadcasters at no charge. I believe that would be completely unfair to others that have had to pay for this priviledge. If new spectrums are granted, it should be at full market price not a cent less.

I enjoy good quality television but I'm not sure I can afford to have my equipment made obsolete. Please don't allow people like myself to be pushed around by these people who are sure they know what is best for me and others like me.

George

Warren

Montgomery,

Al

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <nstrickland@selu.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/1/96 8:37am
Subject: HDTV

Trent Lott's introduction of the NAB's anti-auction into the budget negotiations is an outrage. He has lost touch with the middle class and is being led by Next. Clinton's proposed spectrum auction is on the right track but too modest.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM87-268

From: Russ Alexander <71044.2266@compuserve.com>
To: Reed Hundt <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/31/95 9:15pm
Subject: Gift to Broadcast Industry of channels

I read of a debate concerning awarding commercial firms free use of certain broadcast wavelengths. My vote is that users should pay for any broadcast wavelengths to which they receive rights. This will help reduce the deficit!

Thank you for this opportunity to express a viewpoint.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <BERNTSEN@delphi.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/31/95 4:49pm
Subject: HDTV

To: Mr. Reed E. Hundt

I have just completed 15 years as a member of my citys cable advisory board.

My fear about HDTV is that the broadcasters will want all this bandwidth and it will turn out to be programing for only a few people. The picture quality on a modern color television is outstanding. The stereo sound is beautiful and the price is affordable. The price of cable in Portage In. is about \$22.00 for expanded basic. So that means that for \$22.00 a month plus about \$300.00 for a excellent new tv you can have a so called low definition picture that rivals HDTV. People are not so discriminating. They want a good big picture and good sound. HDTV is for the few who can let you watch a foot ball game on new years day and brag about the picture and sound instead of enjoying the game. By the way, I just retired this year after 42 years as a television sevice technician. HDTV is converted fron analog to digital and back a couple of times before being transmitted as a digital signal. Come on, lets worry about the majority who use a television for entertainment instead of show business during the Rose Bowl game.

Sincerly, Chuck BERNTSEN@DELPHI.COM

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABOVE

MM 87-268

From: Tetrad <garlicgr@pond.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/31/95 2:05pm
Subject: analog vs. digital TV

To: Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission
From: Dorene Pasekoff, 224 Morgan St., Phoenixville, PA 19460

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I am writing to you in response to the 12/28/95 Philadelphia Inquirer article, "TV's Future Has Its Price: New TV Sets." The article states that the broadcast TV industry wishes to change from an analog signal to a digital one. Although the change to a digital signal would improve both picture and sound quality, this improvement will not be noticable unless one's TV set is 35 inches or larger.

Although I currently own three TV sets, none of them is even close to 35 inches. I cannot foresee ever wanting such a large TV set. Therefore, this change in "quality" will not only be invisible in my life, but it will force me to go out and buy completely new TV sets. Far from encouraging me to watch more TV, this move will convince me to spend more time on the Internet and listening to National Public Radio!

The move from an analog to a digital TV signal is a bonus only for the TV manufacturing industry. Surely there are better ways to boost the US economy! It does not benefit US consumer. Please do not approve this move from an analog to a digital TV signal. Also, please support the current Clinton Administration proposal to auction the TV broadcast channels.

Sincerely,
Dorene Pasekoff

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM87-268

From: Lucia Ann Fraboni <lfraboni@hdvision.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/4/96 11:12am
Subject: HDTV

I have witnessed High Defintion, and I am all for the transition from NTSC to HD. I believe that once the American public sees the quality of HD, they too will want to pay the added cost. The sooner a standard is set the better.
Good Luck!

Sincerely,
Lucia Fraboni

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <Beadley123@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 7:10pm
Subject: HDTV

I WANT MY HDTV

For once let the public decide.....

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE AT SEATTLE, WA

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Adrienne Cox <cox@radonc.unc.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 3:51pm
Subject: auction those HDTV bands!

Reed E. Hundt, Chairman
FCC

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Hundt,

I would like to express in the strongest possible way my fervent wish that the FCC auction off broadcast bands for HDTV, rather than giving them away.

In this day of deficit and government shutdown it is inconceivable to me that we should simply give away to commercial interests a public resource that has the potential to bring in billions of dollars to our strapped government. There is no way to justify a governmental failure to support members of our society who are barely making it while at the same time having a governmental giveaway so that broadcasters have an essentially public-subsidized opportunity to make even more money from the pockets of an increasingly polarized and struggling citizenry. This is particularly offensive since among the first things those broadcasters will do is turn around and tell us all to buy new televisions to replace our suddenly obsolete models. We are certainly not talking public service here!

Again, I urge you strongly to require that HDTV broadcasters pay for their exclusive use of the airwaves just like the cellular phone people have been required to do. Anything less is a disservice to the people of this country.

Thank you for your earlier comments regarding standing up for the public interest. It is clear here where the public interest lies, and it is not in a giveaway. Stand firm!

By the way, for every letter you get like this one, there are many many more of us who are equally outraged but haven't got the ability to convey their feelings to the appropriate parties. People who are aware of this whole story are disgusted, but most people will have no idea what is about to happen under their noses until it is too late.

Sincerely,

Adrienne D. Cox
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <HZCONSULT@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 1:59pm
Subject: HDTV

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Reed E Hundt, Chairman
FCC

Dear Sir:

I see that the TV Broadcasters are proposing a conversion to HDTV. Instead of a dual system, they are asking that the current analog system be replaced, thus making useless all TVs now in use. I call upon you and the FCC to reject this approach.

It has always been the policy of the FCC to offer new systems for those who wish to pay for the new technology, while retaining the older systems for those who do not wish, or cannot afford, to convert. I offer as examples stereo (AM, FM, and TV) and color TV. Furthermore, large (35" or more) expensive (\$1500 or more) digital sets must be purchased in order to see the difference in the new system. If total conversion is made a \$200 converter will be needed to enable current TV sets to view the digital signal, with NO improvement in picture quality.

Do you represent the well to do or ALL the people? How can you allow the costs of a new system to be borne by ALL the people? Let those rich enough to afford the new technology pay for it. Let those who prefer the cutting edge pay for it. Have pity on the poor, the elderly, and other less affluent viewers. Will you confiscate one of their few pleasures?

If HDTV is such a great advance, over time costs will drop and people will replace their sets with the newer type. If not greatly superior, HDTV will meet the same fate as Quadriphonic audio. Let the free market place decide.

Frederick W Holzwarth
181 Chestnut Drive
Richboro, PA 18954

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM87-268

From: Janet Swartzbaugh <swajo@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/3/96 10:13am
Subject: broadcasting

Concerning the controversey over changing the transmission of television programs. Personally, I do not think it should happen any time soon. My biggest concern is the so-called "quality" programming. I see very little, outside of a rare few cable-offered stations, that have anything that I consider as educational or quality. I, as a parent, am concerned about this medium of entertainment. Living overseas in countries where students receive a better quality of education taught me to notice that the children's programming there was of a better quality and that they offer less garbage. Growing minds that are obsessed with cartoons, talk shows, cops, and bad sitcoms have little room or interest for their books. Most of the Europeans that I know far exceed my generation in knowledge and ability, also in the desire to achieve. I'm sure that there is a connection. However, if the stations will offer better quality programming aimed at all age groups, far be it for me to complain. Children need to be stimulated, not sedated and apathetic. I see my fourteen year old brother sit daily in front of the TV for hours without moving. That same brother cannot hold a conversation with adults and is constantly on the borderline of failing. Parents who have to work all day to survive and support families have little power to regulate what children do in their free time when the parents are at work. Perhaps the government should spend less time kissing up to wealthy corporations and spend more time investing in the educations of our nations greatest resource, the children.

On that note, I would like to touch on the issue of the cost of these changes. First of all, the auctioning of extra stations does not sound like a bad idea, IF the proceeds really circulate back to the tax payers, the common people. Formal legislation passed by the VOTERS might be in order to see if the people are willing to pay the cost of adaptors or new TV sets; as well as to see if the voters approve of proposed uses for the money gained from auctions. Will these extra channels guarantee the choose of either new or old programming being available? People on limited incomes should not lose their viewing of such important things as the news. Our country is uninformed as it is, we should not encourage this problem further. What sort of benefits do the people get from these changes, other than improved picture and sound quality? Most of the shows offered are bad enough as they are, I do not think that I care to see or hear them any better. Change the quality of the programming before you worry about the quality of the sound and picture. They are less important than our children's minds. Sincerely,
Sara E. Swartzbaugh

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

MM87-268

From: Clay Harter <harter@net1.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 10:54am
Subject: Digital HDTV Standards

To: Reed Hundt
Chairman, FCC

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Having just read an article in the paper today about some of the issues surrounding HDTV broadcast standards I felt compelled to write this note.

As a taxpayer, voter, and consumer (with no connection to the broadcast or electronics industry) I would like to express the following opinions:

- the government, through the FCC, should play a proactive role in encouraging a quick transition to a single digital broadcast standard
- the US standard should be compatible with the rest of the world
(consumers have suffered because of present divergent standards: e.g. NTSC, PAL, SECAM, etc...)
- the gains in going to a digital broadcast standard will easily justify the cost of purchasing new equipment (my family has delayed buying a new TV with the hopes of investing in a digital TV in the future)
- if, in the FCC's best judgement, it is necessary to grant free broadcast licenses during a transition period to encourage broadcasters to make the investment, I would support this policy (with the proviso that broadcasters are required to abide by a specified transition schedule in return for licenses)
- the synergistic benefits of going digital (e.g. easier integration with PC's, creation of new types of multimedia broadcast software, opportunity for creation of new types of consumer electronic devices, creation of new jobs, etc...) far outway the possible loss of license revenue
- the FCC should NOT establish standards that favour US industry at the expense of technical quality and future flexibility (this would be a short-sighted trade-off)

These are some of my unsolicited comments. Good luck in navigating your way through the various lobbying groups
.....

Sincerely,

Clay Harter
3726 Robinhood
Houston, TX 77005 email: harter@net1.net

Clay Harter & Marcia Adelson harter@net1.net

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

MM 87-268

From: Dan Schenck <schendr@POSC.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 4:17am
Subject: Comments on HDTV

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

TO: Mr. Reed Hundt, Chairman, FCC

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the switch to HDTV.

I am strongly in favor of switching to HDTV. I think it will be necessary for competitive reasons, as well as enhancing the enjoyment television broadcasting.

Over the period of time it will take to make the transition, I do not think the switch to new equipment will be a major problem for the American public. People are willing to buy new hardware if they see a benefit in it. Just look at the sales of PCs if you want proof of that.

I understand and support the argument that broadcasters need access to new bandwidth to transition to the new HDTV channels. What I am NOT in favor of however, is turning over a whole sector of the public airwaves to television broadcasters so they can simply multiply the number of conventional programming channels they beam into my house. Allowing broadcasters to do this would not really serve to move us to HDTV and would be an unfair give-away of the public airwaves.

To avoid this situation, I propose the following solution. Charge broadcasters a fee for every hour of conventional programming they broadcast per channel on the transition bandwidth they are given access to. The more HDTV they transmit, the lower the fee. 100% HDTV transmission would be free. The fee could be graduated over time, with a lower fee in the early transition years and a steeper fee in the later years.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards,

Dan Schenck

-- =====
= Dan Schenck - Data Model Project Leader =
= Petrotechnical Open Software Corporation =
= Houston, TX POSC Home Page: <http://www.posc.org> =
= Email: schenck@posc.org Voice: (713) 784-1880 =
=====

CC: Dan Schenck <schenck@posc.posc.org>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

From: <WB7OFrank@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/6/96 3:52pm
Subject: Transition from Analog to Digital TV bcast

MM 87-268

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996

To Mr. Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, FCC:

On December 27, 1995, our local newspaper published an article from Knight-Ridder News Service, describing efforts by the National Association of Broadcasters, NBC, ABC, and CBS to introduce digital broadcasting in this country. I am opposed to this effort on the part of business to introduce digital TV broadcasts in the manner described in the article.

According to the article, the digital broadcast technology would render obsolete all currently-operating television receivers in this country, at an estimated cost of \$187 billion to consumers. My wife and I use a 25" RCA XL-100 TV receiver, which we purchased new in 1973. It's picture is so clear, that we can see individual hairs on close-ups of peoples' faces. If our set works, why should we want to replace it just to accomodate business profit?

According to the article, the TV business interests see digital technology as making a difference in TV pictures only of 35-inches and larger size. My wife and I belong to the great majority of people who don't have the means to purchase such large and obviously expensive TV receivers.

According to the article, the broadcast business interests are asking for free use of second TV channels for 15 years to be able to broadcast digital signals alongside existing channels that broadcast the current analog signals. RF spectrum space is very limited; do such extra frequencies exist to permit duality of channels? What's wrong with the concept of time-share, i.e. broadcast analog for certain periods and digital for other periods using the same channel?

According to the article, the TV business interests see the digital broadcast technology as hope for building TV audiences. Why not broadcast better quality programs (With, for instance, less sex and violence) to attract viewers? Also, TV business interests must recognize that home computers are a growing source of competition for spare time available to consumers. After all, it's a free country.

According to the article, viewers would be able to buy converters for about \$200 which would convert the broadcast digital signal back to an analog signal that would work on existing TV receivers. Why would viewers have to be required to do this? My parents told me that many years ago, when this country changed the electric power frequency from 50 Hz to 60 Hz, the power utility companies supplied conversion equipment to make home washing machines operate at their former speed (The conversion made them operate 20% faster and unsafely).

When this country transitioned from black & white to color television, two color-producing schemes were being considered: The CBS method which used a rotating color wheel in front of the TV camera lens and TV receiver picture tube, and the NBC method which used electronic technology to produce a color picture. The FCC approved the NBC method because it was self-contained, simpler for the consumer, and was fully compatible with existing black & white receivers.

In summary, I feel that the transition from analog to digital broadcast technology should be permitted only under the requirement that no new TV channels be permitted the broadcasters, and the new digital broadcast be fully compatible with existing TV receivers without added expense to the consumer.

I appreciate the opportunity extended by you to private citizens to comment on the proposed change to TV broadcasting technology. Your interest in the public's desires is indicative of your high dedication to the public interest. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank A. Allard
3023-B East 3400 North RD
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Internet address: WB7O Frank@aol.com

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1